



# HARROGATE DISTRICT SITES & POLICIES DPD

## Sustainability Appraisal Initial Findings


**October 2010**

T P Richards Dip T&RP, MRTPI, Head of Planning Services

**PLANNING DIVISION**

Department of Development Services, Knapping Mount, West Grove Road, Harrogate HG1 2AE.

[www.harrogate.gov.uk/planning](http://www.harrogate.gov.uk/planning)



## **CONTENTS**

### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

Sites and Policies Development Plan Document  
Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment  
Sustainability Appraisal: Initial Findings

### **2.0 APPRAISAL METHODOLOGY**

Approach taken to Sustainability Appraisal  
Consultation

### **3.0 OPTION SELECTION**

Identification of Options  
Comparison of social, environmental and economic effects of the options  
Determining Preferred Options

## **Appendices**

Appendix 1: Screening Determination

Appendix 2: Sustainability Objectives and Assessment Rationale

Appendix 3: Appraisal of Options (Web Version Only)

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

### Sites and Policies Development Plan Document

- 1.1 Following the publication of revised guidance on the preparation of Local Development Frameworks in 2008 (PPS12) the Council has reduced its previously planned production of four more DPDs<sup>1</sup> down to a single Sites and Policies DPD (in addition to the adopted Core Strategy). The Sites and Policies DPD will guide and control development. It will comprise policies to protect the character and heritage of the District and ensure development is of an appropriate scale, type and design. It will also identify appropriate land to be allocated for housing and employment development, new transport infrastructure, new sport, open space and recreation facilities and sites for Gypsies' and Travellers'. This new DPD builds on and adds more detail to the objectives and strategic policies set out in the Core Strategy and ensures that sufficient land is available for new development in line with the strategy for settlement growth as set out in the Core Strategy.

### Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment

- 1.2 There is a mandatory requirement under Section 19(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 to undertake a Sustainability Appraisal of Development Plan Documents. Sustainability Appraisal is a systematic and iterative process that identifies and reports on the likely significant effects of strategies and policies to ensure that decisions are made in accordance with the principles of sustainable development.
- 1.3 Alongside this is a requirement to comply with the requirements of European Directive 2001/42/EC. This requires that a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is undertaken for plans and programmes which are likely to have significant effects on the environment. In accordance with Regulation 9 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 the Council, as the responsible authority, needs to determine whether or not the implementation of the Sites & Policies DPD will have any significant environmental effects. Following consultation with the Consultation Bodies (English Heritage, Natural England, Environment Agency) the Council has concluded that an SEA is required. Details of the Determination can be found at Appendix 1.

### Sustainability Appraisal: Initial Findings

- 1.4 This report sets out the initial findings of the sustainability appraisal for the various site options that have been considered for the District's rural areas and is being published to accompany the Rural Areas Consultation. This report is solely concerned with the appraisal of site options for the rural areas and does not consider either site options in the urban areas (Harrogate, Knaresborough, Ripon) or policies to manage development. Further sustainability appraisal work will be prepared to accompany these elements of the Sites and Policies DPD.

---

<sup>1</sup> Site Allocations (Homes & Jobs) DPD, Development Control Policies DPD, Community Sports Regeneration Area Action Plan, Harrogate & Knaresborough Area Plan (work had yet to commence on this)

## 2.0 APPRAISAL METHODOLOGY

### Approach taken to Sustainability Appraisal

2.1 Table 2.1 sets out the various stages in the process.

**Table 2.1: Stages in the Sustainability Appraisal Process**

<b>Stage A: Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope</b>	
A1.	Identification of other relevant plans and programmes that will affect or influence the Sites & Policies DPD – this identifies how the DPD is influenced by outside factors
A2.	Collection of baseline information – this provides the basis for predicting and monitoring effects and helps to identify sustainability issues
A3.	Identification of sustainability issues – this provides an opportunity to define key issues and develop sustainable plan objectives
A4.	Development of the SA Framework – this provides the mechanism to appraise the sustainability of the DPD
A5.	Consultation on the scope of the SA – this ensures that the SA will be comprehensive and robust enough to support the DPD during later stages
<b>Stage B: Developing and refining options and assessing effects</b>	
B1.	Developing the Options– Options are developed in consultation
B2.	Predicting the effects of the Sites & Policies DPD - this ensures that all significant effects of the options being considered have been predicted
B3.	Evaluating the effects of the DPD – this allows an assessment of the significance of the predicted effects to be made
B4.	Mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects – reduces adverse effects and improves positive effects
B5.	Developing proposals for monitoring – to show how the Sites & Policies DPD is performing in terms of sustainability objectives
<b>Stage C: Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal Report</b>	
C1.	Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal Report – this documents the SA process
<b>Stage D: Consulting on the Draft Sites &amp; Policies DPD and the SA Report</b>	
D1.	Consulting on the SA Report and the Draft DPD – provides an opportunity for statutory bodies and the public to comment
D2.	Appraising significant changes – to ensure that the sustainability implications are understood
D3.	Decision making and providing information – provides information on how the SA process has been taken into account in preparing the Sites & Policies DPD
<b>Stage E : Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the Sites &amp; Policies DPD</b>	
E1.	Monitoring the significant effects of the Sites & Policies DPD – to measure the sustainability performance and identify unforeseen adverse effects
E2.	Responding to adverse effects – to consider how to react if monitoring reveals adverse effects

### ***Setting the Scope***

- 2.2 Work had already been undertaken in connection with the pre-production stages of previously planned DPDs<sup>2</sup> and was reviewed and updated as part of preparing the scoping report for the Sites and Policies DPD.

The following activities have been carried out:

- A review of relevant plans, programmes and strategies
- Collection of baseline information in order to be able to predict and monitor the effects of the Sites & Policies DPD. This includes looking at how the plan area might develop without the DPD being in place.
- Identification of the key sustainability issues
- Development of the Sustainability Appraisal Framework, including objectives and indicators.

- 2.3 The outcome of this work is set out in the Scoping Report and can be viewed at [www.harrogate.gov.uk/harrogate-6481](http://www.harrogate.gov.uk/harrogate-6481) This provides the baseline and context for the sustainability appraisal.

### ***Developing and Refining Options and assessing effects (allocations of land)***

- 2.4 Sites have been identified to the Council as having the potential to come forward for development. This is principally through earlier public consultations (2004, 2006, 2008), or by landowners requesting that a particular site be considered for development outside of those formal consultations. Sites have also been identified through the Council's Urban Housing Capacity Study and Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and the Council's settlement survey work in 2007 and 2009.
- 2.5 As part of the earlier work undertaken for the Site Allocations (Homes & Jobs) DPD the suggested sites have been tested against the Sustainability Appraisal Framework to assess their performance in sustainability terms, with reference to social, environmental and economic factors. In developing the Sites and Policies DPD the sites have been re-appraised in light of the policies in the adopted Core Strategy and refinements to the SA Framework. In addition new sites that have been identified through consultation and site survey work have also been appraised
- 2.6 As noted above, further appraisal work will be undertaken for sites in the urban areas and for policies to manage development. Further information on option selection and assessment is set out below.

### ***Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal Report.***

- 2.8 The Sustainability Appraisal Report documents the process and is a key output. It presents information on the effects of the plan and will accompany the Draft Sites & Policies DPD.

---

<sup>2</sup> This earlier work can be viewed at [www.harrogate.gov.uk/harrogate-5907](http://www.harrogate.gov.uk/harrogate-5907)

The proposed structure of the Sustainability Appraisal Report is set out below.

<b>Structure of Report</b>	<b>Information to include</b>
Summary and outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-technical summary</li> <li>• Statement on the difference the process has made</li> <li>• How to comment on the report</li> </ul>
Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites &amp; Policies DPD</li> <li>• Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment</li> <li>• Report Structure</li> </ul>
Appraisal Methodology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approach adopted to Sustainability Appraisal</li> <li>• Consultation</li> </ul>
Establishing the baseline and providing a context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Links to other strategies, plans and programmes</li> <li>• Baseline characteristics</li> <li>• Difficulties in collecting/limitations of baseline data</li> <li>• Main social, environmental and economic issues</li> <li>• SA Framework, including objectives, targets and indicators</li> </ul>
Option Selection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How the main options were identified</li> <li>• Comparison of the social, environmental and economic effects of the options</li> <li>• Determining Preferred Options</li> </ul>
Prediction & Evaluation of Significant Effects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summary of appraisal findings</li> <li>• Cumulative effects</li> <li>• Proposed mitigation measures.</li> </ul>
Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposals for monitoring</li> </ul>

## **Consultation**

2.9 Consultation on the Scoping Report was carried out between 4 December 2009 and 15 January 2010. The Scoping Report was sent to the Consultation Bodies (Natural England, English Heritage, Environment Agency). In addition the following organisations were also consulted:

- Adjacent Authorities
- North Yorkshire District Councils
- Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber
- Local Government Yorkshire and The Humber
- North Yorkshire County Council
- Nidderdale AONB Joint Advisory Committee
- Harrogate Local Strategic Partnership
- Harrogate District Action for the Environment Group
- Strategic Health Authority
- Yorkshire Forward
- Utility Companies
- Strategic Rail Authority

2.10 The Scoping Report was also made available to the wider community through the Harrogate Borough Council Website.

## 3.0 OPTION SELECTION

### Identification of Options

- 3.1 The SEA Directive requires that the environmental report should consider “reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and geographical scale of the plan or programme” and give “an outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with” (Article 5.1 and Annex I (h))
- 3.2 Sites have been identified to the Council as having the potential to come forward for development. This is principally through earlier public consultations (2004, 2006, 2008), or by landowners requesting that a particular site be considered for development outside of those formal consultations. Sites have also been identified through the Council’s Urban Housing Capacity Study and Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and the Council’s settlement survey work in 2007 and 2009.

### Comparison of social, environmental and economic effects of the options

- 3.3 Central to the Sustainability Appraisal process is the Sustainability Appraisal Framework. This provides a format for describing, analysing and comparing sustainability effects. An SA Framework has been developed that will be used for the Sustainability Appraisals of all component DPDs and SPDs to ensure a consistency of approach. A standardised decision making rationale has been developed for appraising sites, for housing and employment. This allows them to be compared against the SA Framework and against each other on an equal basis.
- 3.4 In respect of assessing sites, refinements have been made to the decision making rationale in light of the experience of assessing areas of land as part of the Urban Extensions Study to support the Core Strategy. This refinement will make the assessment more robust. This approach has been tested at the Examination of the Core Strategy where the Inspector confirmed that the scoring system used in the SA is capable of providing a broad indication of the relative sustainability of the various options. She noted that *‘The approach adopted is in line with best practice guidance, using objectives that reflect relevant social, environmental and economic aspects of sustainability and is appropriate to a rigorous desk top study.’ [Inspector’s Report para 3.83]*. Further refinements may be made as the appraisal work is progressed, particularly in respect of other land uses for which allocations are proposed. The SA Framework, together with the decision making rationale are set out at Appendix 2.
- 3.5 The options have been tested in broad terms against the SA framework with reference to social, environmental and economic factors. The assessment has been carried out using professional judgements taking into account a number of technical studies:
- Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
  - Landscape Assessment
  - Ecological Assessment
  - Historic Environment Appraisal
- 3.6 A detailed assessment matrix is set out at appendix 3 (**available on-line only**) and a summary comparing the options is set out below and is presented by settlement. The summary commentary identifies individual significant effects. Taken cumulatively the effects may result in a site performing poorly against the SA Framework but no individual effect is judged to be significant. Similarly, sites may perform relatively well against the SA Framework cumulatively but there may be individual effects are significant.

<b>Birstwith</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL3: West House Farm	✓✓	x	○
RL3(1): West House Farm	✓✓	xx	○
RL3c: West House Farm	✓✓	✓/x	○
RL1066: OS7862, Darley Road	✓✓	x	○
RL1084: Showfield	✓✓	x	○
RL1084a: Land South of Wreaks Road	✓✓	✓/x	○

### Commentary

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified. Significant positive effects noted relate to those larger sites that provide the opportunity to provide on-site amenity open space and a significant amount of affordable housing.

For all of the sites assessed against the environmental objectives significant negative effects were noted in respect of agricultural land and significant positive effects due to the fact that the sites lie outside of a flood risk area. In addition to these affects sites RL3 and RL3(1) had significant negative landscape effects and RL1066 significant ecological impacts.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing and therefore the impact on the economic objectives is overall neutral.

<b>Bishop Monkton</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL13: Site adjacent to 4, Vic. Terrace	✓✓	x	○
RL27: Allotments off Knbro Rd	✓✓	xx	○
RL117: Land at Knaresborough Road	✓✓	x	○
RL1013: Land north of Hungate	✓✓	✓✓	○

### Commentary

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified. Significant positive effects noted relate to those larger sites that provide the opportunity to provide on-site amenity open space and a significant amount of affordable housing.

For all of the sites assessed against the environmental objectives significant negative effects were noted in respect of agricultural land and significant positive effects due to the fact that the sites lie outside of a flood risk area. No additional significant negative effects were identified.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing and therefore the impact on the economic objectives is overall neutral.

<b>Bishop Thornton</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL1147: Land at West End Farm	✓✓	xx	○
RL2006: Land at West Grove	✓✓	✓/x	○
RL3041: Land South of West Grove	✓✓	✓	○

### Commentary

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified. Significant positive effects noted relate to those larger sites that provide the opportunity to provide on-site amenity open space

For all of the sites assessed against the environmental objectives negative effects were noted in respect of agricultural land and significant positive effects due to the fact that the sites lie outside a flood risk area. No additional significant negative effects were identified.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing and therefore the impact on the economic objectives is overall neutral.

<b>Boroughbridge</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
B2: Land South of Roecliffe Lane	✓✓	xx	○
B4: Three Arrows Field	✓✓	xx	○
B5: Land N of Skelton Road	✓	✓/x	○
B6: Aldborough Gate	✓✓	✓/x	○
B8: Land N of Milby Cut, Milby	✓✓	✓/x	xx
B11(1): Riverside Sawmills	✓✓	✓✓	✓/x
B11: Riverside Sawmills	✓✓	✓✓	✓/x
B18: Brickyard Road, Boroughbridge	✓	xx	✓
B18a: Land East of the Railway, Brickyard Road	✓	xx	✓
B2002: Old Hall Caravan Park, Langthorpe	✓✓	✓✓	○

### Commentary

The majority of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified. Sites B5, B18 and B18a perform less well due to the fact that the site is small (B5) or they have been proposed for employment (B18/B18a). Significant positive effects noted relate to those larger sites that provide the opportunity to provide on-site amenity open space. Significant negative effects were also noted for accessibility in respect of sites B4, B5 and B8.

Against the environmental objectives significant negative effects have been noted in respect of agricultural land for sites B2, B4, B5, B6, B18, B18a and for sites B11 and B11(1) in respect of flood risk. Significant positive effects were noted for sites B5, B6, B2002 in respect of flood risk. In addition to these effects, significant negative effects were noted in respect of the historic environment and landscape for sites B2 and B4 and for site B6 significant negative landscape effects were noted.

For those sites proposed and assessed for housing the impact on the economic objectives is overall neutral. B8 is land currently in employment use and the site has been proposed for housing. This represents a loss of employment land and therefore significant negative effects are noted against the economic objectives. Sites B11 and B11(1) are also in employment use

and development of the site will again represent a loss of employment land, however in this instance the existing business will remain on site as part of any re-development. Sites B18 and B18a have been proposed and assessed for employment use and therefore positive effects are noted against the economic objectives.

<b>Burton Leonard</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL71: Land at Burton Leonard	✓✓	xx	○
RL72: Land at Burton Leonard	✓✓	xx	○
RL76: Land at Burton Leonard	✓✓	✓✓	x
RL90: Land to rear of Oakley House, Burton Leonard	✓✓	xx	○
RL110: Copgrove Road, Burton Leonard	✓✓	xx	○
RL1085(1): Land adj Birkhills, Burton Leonard	✓✓	x	○
RL1109: Hawbers Farm, Burton Leonard	✓✓	x	○
RL3000: Land North of Mill Lane, Burton Leonard	✓✓	x	○
RL3032a: Land at Flats House (North)	✓✓	xx	○
RL3032b: Land at Flats House (North West)	✓✓	xx	○
RL3040: Land at Kayes Farm and Hawbers Farm	✓✓	✓✓	✓

### Commentary

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified. Significant positive effects noted relate to those larger sites that provide the opportunity to provide on-site amenity open space and a significant amount of affordable housing.

When assessed against the environmental objectives, significant positive effects were noted in respect of flood risk with all sites lying outside areas of flood risk. Significant negative effects were noted against RL71, RL72, RL90, RL110, RL1085(1), RL1109, RL3000, RL3032, RL3032a and RL3032b in respect of agricultural land, RL110, RL1085(1), RL3000 and RL3032 in respect of landscape effects, RL71, RL72, RL90 and RL3032b in respect of conservation effects and RL3032 and RL3032b in respect of biodiversity effects.

All sites, with the exception of RL76 and RL3040, have been proposed and assessed for housing therefore the impact on the economic objectives are neutral. RL76 is employment land and as such development for housing represents a loss and therefore negative effects are noted against economic objectives. RL3040 includes RL76 and will retain an element of employment land therefore the impact is positive.

<b>Cundall</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL3043: Land South of Wath Bungalows and The Bungalow	✓✓	xx	○

### Commentary

The site performs very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified.

When assessed against the environmental objectives significant positive effects were noted due to the fact that the sites lie outside a flood risk area. Significant negative effects were noted against RL3043 in respect of agricultural land. No other significant negative effects were noted.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing and therefore the impact on the economic objectives is overall neutral.

<b>Dacre</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL3008: Land East of Oakwell Cottage	✓✓	✓	○

### Commentary

The site performs very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified.

When assessed against the environmental objectives significant positive effects were noted due to the fact that the sites lie outside a flood risk area. No other significant negative effects were noted.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing and therefore the impact on the economic objectives is overall neutral.

<b>Dacre Banks</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL45a: Land at Dacre Banks	✓✓	xx	○
RL45b: Land at Dacre Banks	✓✓	✓/x	○
RL45c: Land at Dacre Banks	✓✓	x	○
RL1124: Land south of The Grange	✓✓	x	○
RL1125: The Grange	✓✓	✓	○
RL1133: Cabin Lane	✓✓	✓/x	○
RL1133(1): Cabin Lane	✓✓	✓/x	○

### Commentary

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified. Significant positive effects noted relate to those larger sites that provide the opportunity to provide on-site amenity open space and a significant amount of affordable housing.

For all of the sites assessed against the environmental objectives significant negative effects were noted against sites RL45a, RL45b, RL45c and RL1124 in respect of Landscape effects and RL45a in respect of Conservation and Ecology effects.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing and therefore the impact on the economic objectives is overall neutral.

<b>Darley</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL4: Land adjoining development limit	✓✓	x	0
RL98: Sheepecote Lane	✓✓	✓	0
RL98(1): Land off Meadow Lane	✓✓	✓✓	0
RL99: Stump Lane	✓✓	✓/x	0
RL99a: Land East of Stumps Lane	✓✓	✓/x	0
RL113: Land at Darley	✓✓	✓/x	0
RL2002: Land at White House	✓✓	x	0

### Commentary

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified. Significant positive effects noted relate to those larger sites that provide the opportunity to provide on-site amenity open space.

Against the environmental objectives no significant effects were noted in respect of sites RL98 and part thereof, RL98(1). The remaining sites all have significant negative effects on the historic environment with RL113 also having a significant negative effect on the landscape setting of the village. Significant positive effects were noted in respect of all sites in so far as they are not within areas at risk of flooding.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing and therefore the impact on the economic objectives is overall neutral.

<b>Dishforth</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL42: Land at Dishforth	✓✓	✓/x	0
RL42(1): Land at Dishforth	✓✓	xxx	0
RL48: Land off Back Lane	✓✓	✓/x	0
RL1040: Land off Back Lane	✓✓	x	0
RL1153: Land to the South of Topcliffe Road	✓✓	x	0

### Commentary

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified. Significant positive effects noted relate to those larger sites that provide the opportunity to provide on-site amenity open space and a significant amount of affordable housing.

For all of the sites assessed against the environmental objectives significant negative effects were noted in respect of agricultural land and significant positive effects due to the fact that the sites lie outside of a flood risk area. In addition to these affects sites RL3 and RL3(1) had significant negative landscape effects.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing and therefore the impact on the economic objectives is overall neutral.

<b>Follifoot</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL25a: Land at Follifoot	✓✓	xx	○
RL1017: Adjacent to Glenshee, Spofforth Lane	✓✓	xx	○
RL1093: Land between Park Side and Oak Cottage	✓✓	xx	○
RL1093(1): Land between Park Side and Oak Cottage	✓✓	xx	○
RL1101: Land east of Manor Fold	✓✓	✓/x	○

### Commentary

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified. Significant positive effects noted relate to those larger sites that provide the opportunity to provide on-site amenity open space and a significant amount of affordable housing.

When assessed against the environmental objectives, significant positive effects were noted in respect of flood risk with all sites lying outside areas of flood risk. Significant negative effects were noted against RL25a, RL1017, RL1093, RL1093(1) and RL1101 in respect of agricultural land, RL1017, RL1093 and RL1093(1) in respect of landscape effects and RL1093(1) in respect of conservation effects.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing, overall the impact on the economic objectives is neutral.

<b>Glasshouses</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL93: Glasshouses Mill	✓✓	✓	✓✓
RL129: Land at Wilsill	✓✓	x	○
RL560: Sandy Lane	✓✓	xx	○
RL1069: Lupton Bank	✓✓	x	○

### Commentary

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified. Significant positive effects noted relate to those larger sites that provide the opportunity to provide on-site amenity open space and a significant amount of affordable housing.

For all of the sites assessed against the environmental objectives negative effects were noted in respect of agricultural land with the exception of RL93 that utilises Brownfield land. Significant positive effects were noted due to the fact that all sites lie outside of a flood risk area with the exception of RL93 that partially lies in flood zone 3. In addition to these affects sites RL129, RL560 and RL1089 had significant negative conservation effects and RL129 and RL560 significant landscape impacts.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing and with the exception of site RL93 the impact on the economic objectives is overall neutral. RL93 is considered to be mixed use, and as such proposes development for both housing and employment land. Significant positive effects are noted in respect of economic effects.

<b>Goldsborough</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL102: Land at Goldsborough	✓✓	xx	○
RL1046: Low Farm	✓✓	x	○
RL1047: Home Farm	✓✓	xx	○

### Commentary

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified. Significant positive effects noted relate to those larger sites that provide the opportunity to provide on-site amenity open space and a significant amount of affordable housing.

For all of the sites assessed against the environmental objectives significant negative effects were noted in respect of agricultural land and significant positive effects due to the fact that the sites lie outside of a flood risk area. In addition to these affects site RL1047 had significant negative effects on the historic environment.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing and therefore the impact on the economic objectives is overall neutral.

<b>Great Ouseburn</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL100: Branton Lane	✓✓	xx	○
RL1050: Back Lane	✓✓	xx	○
RL1050a: Land East Back Lane	✓✓	xx	○
RL1064: Land South of Branton Lane	✓✓	✓/x	○
RL1064a: Land South of Branton Lane	✓✓	✓/x	○
RL1064b: Land South of Branton Lane	✓✓	x	○
RL1115: Land south of Carr Side Road	✓✓	xx	○

### Commentary

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified. Significant positive effects noted relate to those larger sites that provide the opportunity to provide on-site amenity open space and a significant amount of affordable housing.

When assessed against the environmental objectives, significant positive effects were noted in respect of flood risk with all sites lying outside areas of flood risk. Significant negative effects were noted against RL100, RL1050, RL1050a, RL1064, RL1064a RL1064b and RL1115 in respect of agricultural land, RL100, RL1050, RL1050a, RL1064b and RL1115 in respect of landscape effects, RL100, RL1050 and RL1050a in respect of conservation effects and RL1115 in respect of biodiversity effects.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing the overall impact on the economic objectives is neutral.

<b>Green Hammerton</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL12: Land at Bernard Lane	✓✓	x	○
RL1029: Former Council Yard	✓✓	✓✓	xx
RL1079: Boroughbridge Road	✓✓	✓✓	○
RL1102: Between Bernard Lane & Harrogate Rd	✓✓	✓/x	○
RL3002: Land at New Lane	✓✓	x	○
RL3039: Land at West Field and Bernard Lane	✓✓	x	○

### Commentary

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified. Significant positive effects noted relate to those larger sites that provide the opportunity to provide on-site amenity open space and a significant amount of affordable housing.

When assessed against the environmental objectives, significant positive effects were noted in respect of flood risk with all sites lying outside areas of flood risk. Significant negative effects were noted against RL12, RL1102, RL3002 and RL3039 in respect of agricultural land and for RL3002 there were also significant landscape effects. For RL1029 significant landscape effects were noted.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing and with the exception of site RL1029 the impact on the economic objectives is overall neutral. RL1029 is considered to be employment land and as such development for housing represents a loss. Significant negative effects are therefore noted against the economic objectives.

<b>Hampsthwaite</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL37b: Land at Hampsthwaite	✓✓	x	○
RL37c: Land at Hampsthwaite	✓✓	xx	○
RL1141: Land adjacent to Brookfield	✓✓	x	○
RL1141(1): Land adjacent to Brookfield	✓✓	x	○
RL2061: Land at Brookfield Garth	✓✓	✓	○
RL3036: Land South of Brookfield	✓✓	x	○

### Commentary

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified. Significant positive effects noted relate to those larger sites that provide the opportunity to provide on-site amenity open space and a significant amount of affordable housing.

For all of the sites assessed against the environmental objectives significant negative effects were noted in respect of agricultural land and significant positive effects due to the fact that the sites lie outside of a flood risk area. In addition to these affects noted, site RL37c had significant negative landscape and ecological effects.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing and therefore the impact on the economic objectives is overall neutral.

<b>Killinghall</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL118a: Kennel Hall Farm	✓✓	xx	0
RL118a(1): Kennel Hall Farm, North East	✓✓	xx	0
RL118a(2): Kennel Hall Farm, South East	✓✓	xx	0
RL118a(3): Kennel Hall Farm, Ripon Road Frontage	✓✓	xx	0
RL118b: Kennel Hall Farm	✓✓	xx	0
RL118b(1): Kennel Hall Farm	✓✓	xx	0
RL551: Land at Nidd House Farm	✓✓	✓/x	0
RL570: Land at Killinghall	✓✓	x	0
RL1009: Land north of Grainbeck Manor	✓✓	x	0
RL1015: Land at Manor Dairy Farm	✓✓	x	0
RL1015a: Land adjacent to the Cricket Ground	✓✓	✓/x	0
RL1037: Cricket Ground, east of Ripon Road	✓	✓/x	0
RL1043: Land at Grainbeck Manor	✓✓	x	0
RL1132: Former Killinghall Garage	✓✓	✓✓	0
RL2025: Land adjacent to Addison Villas	✓✓	✓/x	0
RL3019: Land north of Pickering Croft Lane	✓✓	x	0
RL3037: Land West of Killinghall Primary School	✓✓	✓/x	0
RL3038: Land South East of Manor Farm	✓✓	✓	0

### **Commentary**

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified. Significant positive effects noted relate to those larger sites that provide the opportunity to provide on-site amenity open space and a significant amount of affordable housing.

With the exception of RL1132 all of the sites assessed against the environmental objectives significant negative effects were noted in respect of agricultural land and significant positive effects due to the fact that the sites lie outside of a flood risk area (with the exception of RL118b where a very small part of the site is at risk of flooding).

In addition to these affects noted a number of the sites have significant ecological, landscape and historical environment effects [RL118a, RL118a(1), RL118a(3)]. RL118a(2), RL118b have significant landscape and historical environment effects whilst RL118b, RL551, RL1015, RL1043, RL2025, RL3019 have significant landscape effects and RL570 have significant historical environment effects.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing and therefore the impact on the economic objectives is overall neutral.

<b>Kirby Hill</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL55: Land at Kirby Hill	✓✓	xx	○
RL1134: Builders Yard	✓✓	✓	xx
RL3034: Fields to the East of St Johns Walk	✓✓	x	○
RL3045: Land North of The Grange	✓✓	x	○

### Commentary

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified. Significant positive effects noted relate to those larger sites that provide the opportunity to provide on-site amenity open space and a significant amount of affordable housing.

For all of the sites assessed against the environmental objectives significant negative effects were noted in respect of agricultural land and significant positive effects due to the fact that the sites lie outside of a flood risk area. In addition to these affects sites RL55 has significant negative effects on the historic environment, ecology and landscape.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing and with the exception of site RL1134 the impact on the economic objectives is overall neutral. RL1134 is considered to be employment land and as such development for housing represents a loss. Significant negative effects are therefore noted against the economic objectives.

<b>Kirk Deighton</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL81: The Croft	✓✓	✓	xx
RL1054: Land west of Wetherby Road	✓✓	xx	○
RL1104: Land west of B6164	✓✓	x	○
RL1146: Land at Scriftain Lane	✓✓	xx	○
RL3042: Land adjacent to the A168	✓✓	✓✓	x

### Commentary

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified. Significant positive effects noted relate to those larger sites that provide the opportunity to provide on-site amenity open space and a significant amount of affordable housing.

When assessed against the environmental objectives, significant positive effects were noted in respect of flood risk with all sites lying outside areas of flood risk. Significant negative effects were noted against all sites in respect of agricultural land. In addition to these effects sites RL1054 and RL1104 had significant negative landscape effects and RL1054 significant impacts on the historic environment.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing and with the exception of site RL81 and RL3042 the impact on the economic objectives is overall neutral. RL81 and RL3042 are considered to be employment land and as such development for housing represents a loss. Significant negative effects are therefore noted against the economic objectives.

<b>Kirk Hammerton</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL10: Jackson's Haulage Depot	✓✓	✓✓	○
RL120: Land at Station Road	✓✓	x	○
RL1011(1): Agricon Premises, Station Road	✓✓	✓✓	○
RL1011: Land at Station Road	✓✓	✓✓	○
RL1034(1): Crooked Lane	✓✓	x	○
RL1034: Crooked Lane	✓✓	xx	○
RL1034a: Land fronting Crooked Lane	✓✓	x	○
RL1142: Land at Lodge Farm Cottage	✓✓	xx	○
RL2034: Land East of Parker Lane	✓✓	xx	○
RL2035a: Land adjacent to Kirk Hammerton Primary School	✓✓	✓/x	○
RL2036a: Land West of Parker Lane	✓✓	xx	○

### Commentary

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified. Significant positive effects noted relate to those larger sites that provide the opportunity to provide on-site amenity open space and a significant amount of affordable housing.

When assessed against the environmental objectives, significant positive effects were noted in respect of flood risk, with the exception of RL1034, with all sites lying outside areas of flood risk. Significant negative effects were noted against all sites in respect of agricultural land. In addition to these affects site RL2034 has significant negative ecological impacts.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing the overall impact on the economic objectives is neutral.

<b>Kirkby Malzeard</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL1035: Galphay Road	✓✓	xx	○
RL1063: Adjacent Richmond Garth	✓✓	xx	○
RL1063(1): Adjacent Richmond Garth	✓✓	xx	○
RL1063a: Adjacent Richmond Garth	✓✓	x	○
RL1091: Land adjacent Lynngarth	✓✓	✓/x	○
RL2022: Land off Galphay Road	✓✓	xx	○
RL2022a: Land East of The Grange	✓✓	xx	○
RL2022b: Land West of The Grange	✓✓	xx	○

### Commentary

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified. Significant positive effects noted relate to those larger sites that provide the opportunity to provide on-site amenity open space and a significant amount of affordable housing.

When assessed against the environmental objectives, significant positive effects were noted in respect of flood risk with all sites lying outside areas of flood risk. Significant negative effects were noted against all sites in respect of agricultural land. In addition significant negative effects

were noted for sites RL1035, RL1063, RL2022, RL2022a in respect of landscape; RL1035, RL1063, RL1063(1), RL2022, RL2022a, RL2022b in respect of conservation and RL2022, RL2022a, RL2022b in respect of biodiversity.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing the overall impact on the economic objectives is neutral.

<b>Lofthouse</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL1122: Rear of the Crown Hotel	✓✓	xx	○
RL3046: Land to the rear of the Crown Hotel	✓✓	x	○

### **Commentary**

Both sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified.

Against the environmental objectives significant negative effects were noted against site RL1122 in respect of landscape and the historic environment together with ecological impacts. Significant positive effects were noted as both sites are not in an area of flood risk.

Both sites have been proposed and assessed for housing the impact on the economic objectives is overall neutral.

<b>Long Marston</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL29a: Land at Long Marston	✓✓	✓/x	○
RL29b: Land at Long Marston	✓✓	xx	○
RL29c: Land at York Road, Long Marston	✓✓	xx	○
RL60: South of Wetherby Road, Long Marston	✓✓	xx	○
RL1144: Land at Angram Road, Long Marston	✓✓	x	○
RL2057: Land to the rear of Angram Road, Long Marston	✓✓	x	○
RL2063: Land to the North of Old Lane, Long Marston	✓✓	x	○

### **Commentary**

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified.

For all of the sites assessed against the environmental objectives significant negative effects were noted in respect of agricultural land and significant positive effects due to the fact that the sites lie outside of a flood risk area. In addition to these affects noted sites RL29b and RL29c had significant negative effects on the historic environment and landscape with RL29b also having significant ecological impacts.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing and therefore the impact on the economic objectives is overall neutral.

<b>Markington</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL1073: High Street/Thwaites Lane	✓✓	xx	○
RL1074: East of the chalet	✓✓	xx	○
RL1075: High Mill Farm	✓✓	x	○

### Commentary

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified. Significant positive effects noted relate to sites that provide the opportunity to provide on-site amenity open space and affordable housing.

When assessed against the environmental objectives, significant positive effects were noted in respect of flood risk with all sites lying outside areas of flood risk. Significant negative effects were noted against all sites in respect of agricultural land. In addition to these affects all sites have significant negative effects on the historic environment and RL1073 has significant negative ecological impacts.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing the overall impact on the economic objectives is neutral.

<b>Marion cum Grafton</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL61: Middle Row	✓✓	xx	○
RL61a: Middle Row	✓✓	xx	○
RL87: Land at Grafton	✓✓	xx	○
RL1111: Land at Stockfield Lane	✓✓	xx	○
RL1126: Yew Tree Farm	✓✓	xx	○
RL1126(1): Yew Tree Farm	✓✓	xx	○

### Commentary

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified. Significant positive effects noted relate to those larger sites that provide the opportunity to provide on-site amenity open space and a significant amount of affordable housing.

For all of the sites assessed against the environmental objectives significant negative effects were noted in respect of agricultural land and significant positive effects due to the fact that the sites lie outside of a flood risk area. In addition to these affects noted all of the sites [with the exception of RL1126(1)] have significant negative effects on the historic environment and the landscape setting of the village.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing and therefore the impact on the economic objectives is overall neutral.

<b>Masham</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
M1: Auction Mart, Leyburn Road	✓✓	✓	x
M3: Thorpe Road	✓✓	x	○
M5: Fearby Road	✓✓	xx	○
M6: Westholme Road	✓✓	xx	○
M7: Jameson's Warehouse & Office, Leyburn Road	✓✓	✓✓	xx
M1001: Thorpe Road	✓✓	xx	○
M1002: Westholme Road	✓✓	xx	○
M1004: Land east of Thorpe Road	✓✓	xx	○
M3001: Land at Ibbetson Close	✓✓	xx	○
M3002: Land West of The Oaks	✓✓	xx	○

### Commentary

The majority of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified. Sites M3, M5 and M1001 perform less well. Significant positive effects noted relate to those larger sites that provide the opportunity to provide on-site amenity open space and a significant amount of affordable housing. Significant negative effects were noted in respect of accessibility for sites M3, M5, M1001, M1002, M1004, M3002.

When assessed against the environmental objectives, significant positive effects were noted in respect of flood risk, with the exception of sites M1, M5, M6, M7, M1002 and M3002, with all sites lying outside an area at risk from flooding. Significant negative effects were noted against all sites, with the exception of M1 and M7, in respect of agricultural land. In addition to these affects site M5 has significant negative landscape and conservation impacts.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing and with the exception of site M1 and M7 the impact on the economic objectives is overall neutral. M1 and M7 are considered to be employment land and as such development for housing represents a loss.

<b>Melmerby</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL43: Manor Fold Farm, Melmerby	✓✓	x	○
RL80: Melmerby Hall, Melmerby	✓✓	x	○
RL1010: Land at Wobeck Lane, Melmerby	✓✓	xx	○
RL1010a: Land to the south of Wobeck Rise, Melmerby	✓✓	x	○
RL1010b: Land to the east of Wobeck Lane	✓✓	✓/x	○
RL3016: Land at Underlands Lane, Melmerby	✓✓	xx	○

### Commentary

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified.

For all of the sites assessed against the environmental objectives significant negative effects were noted in respect of agricultural land (except RL80) and significant positive effects due to the fact that the sites lie outside of a flood risk area. In addition to these effects site RL80 had significant negative effects on the historic environment, landscape, ecology whilst RL3016 had significant negative landscape effects.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing and therefore the impact on the economic objectives is overall neutral.

<b>Minskip</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL39a: Land at Minskip	✓✓	✓/x	○
RL1127: Peach Tree Farm, Minskip	✓✓	x	○
RL1128: Grange Farm, Minskip	✓✓	xx	○
RL1128(1): Grange Farm	✓✓	x	○
RL3044: Land Opposite Prospect Terrace	✓✓	x	○

### Commentary

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified.

For all of the sites assessed against the environmental objectives significant negative effects were noted in respect of agricultural land and significant positive effects due to the fact that the sites lie outside a flood risk area. In addition to these effects RL1128 has significant negative effects on the landscape.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing and therefore the impact on the economic objectives is overall neutral.

<b>Pannal</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
H74 (1): Dunlopillo Site (EMP)	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
H74a: Dunlopillo Site (MIXED – Majority emp)	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
H74: Dunlopillo Site (MIXED)	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓
RL2023: Land adjacent to Low Garth, Daw Cross	✓✓	xx	○
RL2024: Land at Hillfoot Lane, Daw Cross	✓✓	x	○
RL2073a: Land S and W of Crimple Valley Garden Centre	✓✓	xx	○
RL2073b: Land opposite Fieldhurst, Leeds Road	✓✓	xx	○

### Commentary

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified. Significant positive effects noted relate to those larger sites that provide the opportunity to provide on-site amenity open space and a significant amount of affordable housing.

With the exception of sites H74, H74a and H74(1) (currently developed for employment use) significant negative effects were noted in respect of agricultural land and significant positive effects for sites RL2023, RL2024 and RL2073b due to the fact that the sites lie outside of a flood risk area. In addition to those effects noted for sites RL2023 and RL2073a significant effects were noted on respect of the historical environment, landscape and ecology.

Most of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing and therefore the impact on the economic objectives is overall neutral. H74 and H74a have been assessed for housing and employment and H74(1) has been assessed for employment use and park and ride facility and therefore significant positive effects have been noted against the economic objectives as the sites are retained for employment use (to a greater or lesser extent).

<b>Pateley Bridge</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
P1: Land off Church Lane	✓✓	✓	○
P2: Pateley Bridge Highways Depot	✓✓	✓✓	✓
P3: Land at Low Wath Road	✓	✓/x	○
P3a: Land at Ashfield Court Road, Pateley Bridge	✓✓	✓/x	○
P5: Land opposite Nidderdale High School	✓✓	x	○
P5a: Land opposite Nidderdale High School	✓✓	x	○
P6: Coal yard, Greenwood Road	✓✓	✓✓	xx
P1001: Land at Low Wath Road Pateley Bridge	✓✓	xx	○
P3000: Land South of Church Lane, Pateley Bridge	✓✓	xx	○
P3001: Coal Yard and Highways Depot, Pateley Bridge	✓✓	✓✓	✓

### Commentary

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified. Significant positive effects noted relate to those larger sites that provide the opportunity to provide on-site amenity open space and a significant amount of affordable housing. Significant negative effects were noted in respect of accessibility for sites P3, P3a, P5 and P5a.

When assessed against the environmental objectives, positive effects were noted against all sites in respect of agricultural land. Significant positive effects were noted in respect of flood risk for all sites except sites P2, P6 and P3001, with the remaining sites lying outside areas of flood risk. In addition to these effects sites P1001, P3000 have significant negative landscape effects, sites P1 and P3000 has significant negative conservation impacts and site P1001 significant negative ecological effects.

All sites, with the exception of P2, P6 and P3001, have been proposed and assessed for housing therefore the impact on the economic objectives are neutral. P2, P6 and P3001 is employment land, P6 has significant negative economic effects as development for housing represents a loss of employment land. P2 and P3001 are proposed to incorporate an element of employment land, therefore the impact is positive.

<b>Rainton</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL1092: Land at Brakehill Farm, Rainton	✓✓	x	○
RL3031: The Grange, Rainton	✓✓	✓/x	○

### Commentary

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified. In addition significant positive effects noted relate to those larger sites that provide the opportunity to provide on-site amenity open space

For all of the sites assessed against the environmental objectives significant negative effects were noted in respect of agricultural land and significant positive effects due to the fact that the sites lie outside a flood risk area. In addition to these effects site RL1092 had significant negative effects on the historic environment.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing and therefore the impact on the economic objectives is overall neutral.

<b>Ripley</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
DL70: Land adjacent to the by-pass	✓✓	xx	0

### Commentary

The site performs very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified.

When assessed against the environmental objectives significant positive effects were noted due to the fact that the sites lie outside a flood risk area. Significant negative effects were noted in respect of agricultural land, landscape and historic environment.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing and therefore the impact on the economic objectives is overall neutral.

<b>Scotton</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL32: Land at Scotton	✓✓	x	0
RL124: Land at Mire Syke Lane	✓✓	xx	0
RL1057: Mire Syke Lane	✓✓	xx	0
RL1108: Land east of Main Street	✓✓	xx	0
RL3025: Land West of Pennymead Cottage	✓✓	✓/x	0
RL3026: Land East of Pennymead Cottage	✓✓	✓/x	0
RL3035: Land North of Manor Drive	✓✓	✓	0

### Commentary

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified. Significant positive effects noted relate to those larger sites that provide the opportunity to provide on-site amenity open space and a significant amount of affordable housing.

When assessed against the environmental objectives, significant positive effects were noted in respect of flood risk with all sites lying outside areas of flood risk. Significant negative effects were noted against all sites in respect of agricultural land. In addition to these affects RL124, RL1108 and RL1057 has significant negative conservation effects and RL32 and RL124 has significant negative landscape impacts.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing the overall impact on the economic objectives is neutral.

<b>Sharow</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL16: Land south of Marythorpe, Sharow	✓✓	✓/x	0
RL1116: The Holt, Sharow	✓✓	✓/x	0

### Commentary

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified. In addition significant positive effects noted relate to those larger sites that provide the opportunity to provide on-site amenity open space

For all of the sites assessed against the environmental objectives significant negative effects were noted in respect of agricultural land and significant positive effects due to the fact that the sites lie outside a flood risk area. No other significant effects were noted.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing and therefore the impact on the economic objectives is overall neutral.

<b>Sicklinghall</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL1145: Land adjacent to Sicklinghall Primary School	✓✓	xx	○
RL2017: Orchard Cottage Paddock, Sicklinghall	✓✓	xx	○
RL2046: Land at Raventofts Farm, Sicklinghall	✓✓	xx	○
RL2047: Land at Back Lane, Sicklinghall	✓✓	xx	○

### **Commentary**

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified. In addition significant positive effects noted relate to those larger sites that provide the opportunity to provide on-site amenity open space

For all of the sites assessed against the environmental objectives significant negative effects were noted in respect of agricultural land and significant positive effects due to the fact that the sites lie outside a flood risk area. In addition to these effects in respect of site RL1145 significant negative landscape effects were noted.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing and therefore the impact on the economic objectives is overall neutral.

<b>Skelton on Ure</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL553: Land at Willow Garth, Skelton on Ure	✓✓	✓	○
RL554: Land opposite Manor Farm, Skelton on Ure	✓✓	x	○
RL555(1): Land at Manor Farm, Skelton on Ure	✓✓	x	○
RL555: Land at Manor Farm, Skelton on Ure	✓✓	✓/x	○
RL2016: Land adjacent Crowgarth, Skelton on Ure	✓✓	✓/x	○

### **Commentary**

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified. In addition significant positive effects noted relate to those larger sites that provide the opportunity to provide on-site amenity open space

For all of the sites assessed against the environmental objectives significant negative effects were noted in respect of agricultural land and significant positive effects due to the fact that the sites lie outside a flood risk area. In addition to these effects in respect of site RL554 significant negative effects were noted on the historic environment and landscape

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing and therefore the impact on the economic objectives is overall neutral.

<b>Spofforth</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL68: Massey Garth	✓✓	xx	○
RL2043: Land at Castle Farm	✓✓	✓/x	○

### Commentary

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified. Significant positive effects noted relate to those larger sites that provide the opportunity to provide on-site amenity open space and a significant amount of affordable housing.

When assessed against the environmental objectives, significant positive effects were noted in respect of flood risk with all sites lying outside areas of flood risk. Significant negative effects were noted in respect of agricultural land, and for RL68 in respect of landscape and conservation effects.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing, overall the impact on the economic objectives is neutral.

<b>Staveley</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL2: Land at Arkendale Road, Staveley	✓✓	xx	○
RL70: West of All Saints Church, Staveley	✓✓	xx	○
RL1113(1): Land between Minskip Road & Low Field Lane	✓✓	✓/x	○

### Commentary

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified. In addition significant positive effects noted relate to those larger sites that provide the opportunity to provide on-site amenity open space

For all of the sites assessed against the environmental objectives significant negative effects were noted in respect of agricultural land and significant positive effects due to the fact that the sites lie outside a flood risk area. In addition to these effects significant negative ecology effects were noted for sites RL2 and RL70.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing and therefore the impact on the economic objectives is overall neutral.

<b>Summerbridge</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL131: Land adjacent to Methodist Church	✓✓	x	○
RL131(1): Land adjacent to Methodist Church	✓✓	✓/x	○
RL1107: Land south of Whinfields	✓✓	✓/x	○
RL1107a: Land south of Whinbush Lane	✓✓	✓/x	○
RL2014: Land adjacent to Riggs Spring	✓✓	x	○

### Commentary

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified. Significant positive effects noted relate to those larger sites that provide the opportunity to provide on-site amenity open space and a significant amount of affordable housing.

When assessed against the environmental objectives, significant positive effects were noted in respect of flood risk with all sites lying outside areas of flood risk. Significant negative effects were noted against RL131, RL131(1), RL1107, RL1107a in respect of landscape effects, RL1107 and RL2014 in respect of conservation effects and RL131 and RL2014 in respect of biodiversity effects.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing the overall impact on the economic objectives is neutral.

<b>Tockwith</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL14: Land at Tockwith	✓✓	✓/x	○
RL14a: Land North of Southfield Lane	✓✓	x	○
RL14(1): Land at Tockwith	✓✓	x	○
RL103a: Land at Tockwith	✓✓	✓	○
RL103b: Land at Tockwith	✓✓	x	○
RL1014: Land south of Westfield Road	✓✓	✓/x	○
RL1022: Kendall Lane	✓✓	xx	○
RL1055: Southfield Lane	✓✓	xx	○
RL1086: Land off Marston Road	✓✓	xx	○
RL1086a: Land off Marston Road	✓✓	x	○
RL1086a(1): Land off Marston Road	✓✓	xx	○
RL1086b: Land off Marston Road	✓✓	xx	○
RL2054: Land at the airfield	✓✓	x	○

### Commentary

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified. Significant positive effects noted relate to those larger sites that provide the opportunity to provide on-site amenity open space and a significant amount of affordable housing.

When assessed against the environmental objectives, moderate negative effects were noted against RL1086, RL1086a, RL1086b and RL1086a(1) due to less than 50% of the site area affected by Flood Zone 2 or 3a. Significant negative effects were noted against all sites in

respect of agricultural land, RL14(1), RL103a, RL1055 and RL1086 in respect of landscape effects, RL14(1) and RL1055 in respect of biodiversity effects.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing the overall impact on the economic objectives is neutral.

<b>Wath</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL3033: Hargreaves Ash Marketing Site , Main Street, Wath	✓✓	✓✓	xx

### **Commentary**

The site performs very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified.

When assessed against the environmental objectives no significant negative effects were noted

The site has been proposed and assessed for housing. This is a site that is currently in employment use and therefore significant negative effects were noted against the economic objectives.

<b>Whixley</b>	<b>Soc</b>	<b>Env</b>	<b>Econ</b>
RL1068: West farm, Whixley	✓✓	xx	o
RL1129: Land to the west of High Street, Whixley	✓✓	xx	o
RL1130: Land east of Station Road, Whixley	✓	xx	o
RL1131: Land west of Station Road, Whixley	✓✓	x	o

### **Commentary**

All of the sites perform very well against the social objectives, with no significant negative effects identified. In addition significant positive effects noted relate to those larger sites that provide the opportunity to provide on-site amenity open space

For all of the sites assessed against the environmental objectives significant negative effects were noted in respect of agricultural land and significant positive effects due to the fact that the sites lie outside a flood risk area. No other significant effects were noted.

All of the sites have been proposed and assessed for housing and therefore the impact on the economic objectives is overall neutral.

### **Determining Preferred Options**

3.6 The Sustainability Appraisal has highlighted, in broad terms, which sites have performed better against the sustainability objectives than others. This has been important in influencing the choice of Preferred Options. Other important factors and information have also influenced the choice of Preferred Options. This includes:

- The planning policy context e.g the amount of housing and employment land required in the District and within different settlements across the District
- Accessibility
- Impact on the form and character of the settlement

- Development constraints (physical or policy)

The approach to selection of preferred options is set out in detail in *Harrogate District Sites and Policies DPD: Selection of Preferred Site Options – A Methodology Paper*. As the Preferred Options are refined, further appraisal work will be required. Where adverse effects are identified, proposals for mitigation will also be considered. This will be set out in the Sustainability Appraisal Report that will be published alongside the Draft Sites and Policies DPD.

## THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF PLANS AND PROGRAMMES REGULATIONS 2004

### REGULATION 9 SCREENING DETERMINATION

#### Harrogate District Sites and Policies DPD

##### Introduction

European Union Directive 2001/42/EC requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment to be undertaken for certain types of plans or programmes that would have a significant environmental effect. It is for the Council to determine whether an SEA is required. The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (the regulations) require that this is determined by a screening process, which should use a specified set of criteria (set out in Schedule 1 of the Regulations). The results of this process must be summarised in an SEA Screening Statement, which must be publicly available.

Before the Council make a formal determination, there is a requirement to consult three statutory consultation bodies designated in the regulations (English Heritage, Environment Agency, Natural England) on whether an environmental assessment is required.

This document is the Screening Determination of the need to carry out a Strategic Environmental Assessment for the Harrogate District Sites and Policies DPD and is made in accordance with the regulations.

##### Determination

In accordance with Regulation 9 of the SEA Regulations 2004 the Council, as the responsible authority, has determined that an environmental assessment of the emerging Sites and Policies DPD is required as it is likely to have significant environmental effects. In making this determination the Council has had regard to Schedule 1 of the Regulations and carried out consultation with the consultation bodies.

An assessment against Schedule 1 of Regulations and comments made by the Consultation bodies are set out below.

This determination has been made on **Wednesday 7<sup>th</sup> April 2010**

##### Further Information

A copy of this statement will be sent to the Consultation Bodies and made available on the Council's website at [www.harrogate.gov.uk/harrogate-6481](http://www.harrogate.gov.uk/harrogate-6481)

It will also be available on request at:

Council Offices, Crescent Gardens, Harrogate, HG1 2SG  
Council Offices Knapping Mount, West Grove Road, Harrogate, HG1 2AE

During normal office hours.

**THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF PLANS AND  
PROGRAMMES REGULATIONS 2004: SCHEDULE 1**

**Criteria for determining the likely significance of effects on the environment**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Assessment</b>
1. The characteristics of plans and programmes, having regard, in particular to:	
(a) degree to which the plan or programme sets a framework for projects and other activities, either with regard to the location, nature, size and operating conditions or by allocating resources	The DPD makes allocations of land for development across the district and also provides the policy framework for determining planning applications.
(b) degree to which the plan or programme influences other plans and programmes including those in a hierarchy	This DPD, together with the Core Strategy provides a framework for Supplementary Planning Documents.
(c) relevance of the plan or programme for the integration of environmental considerations in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development	In setting out the site allocations, development guidelines will also be provided which will include environmental considerations. There are also specific environmental policies in the plan for controlling development.
(d) environmental problems relevant to the plan or programme	The Scoping Report has identified a number of environmental problems relevant to the plan.
(e) relevance of the plan or programme for the implementation of Community legislation on the environment (eg plans and programmes linked to waste management or water protection)	The DPD will include a policy to mark on the Proposals Map natural environmental designations, including those derived from Community legislation.
2. Characteristics of the effects and of the area likely to be affected, having regard, in particular to:	
(a) probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of effects	The Sites and Policies DPD will make allocations of land for new development and provide a policy framework for controlling development
(b) cumulative nature of the effects	There are likely to be cumulative effects arising from and between the different policies in the DPD
(c) transboundary nature of the effects	There will be no transboundary effects.
(d) risks to human health or the environment	New development affords the opportunity to create risks to the environment without adequate controls and or mitigation measures being in place.
(e) magnitude and spatial extent of the effects (geographical area and size of the population likely to be affected)	Spatial effect will be across the District. There is a requirement to plan for some 390 homes per year across the district together with land for a range of other uses including employment. There will be a range of effects associated with this including environmental.
(f) value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to : - special characteristics or cultural heritage - exceeded environmental quality standards or limits - intensive land use	The District is characterised by high quality and diverse landscape and wildlife which over the years has been threatened by development pressures. The district also contains many assets important to cultural heritage including a World Heritage site.
(g) effects on areas or landscapes which have a recognised national, community or international protection status	The District contains a number of areas which have a recognised national or community protection status. These include an AONB, SSSI's and Special Protection Area/Special Area of Conservation. Appropriate Assessment will also be undertaken in accordance with the European Habitats Directive

## Responses from the Consultation Bodies

Before making a determination under Regulation 9, the following Consultation Bodies were consulted:

- Natural England
- Environment Agency
- English Heritage

The responses received are set out below.

Environment Agency	We note that you have determined that the implementation of the Sites and Policies DPD will have significant environmental effects upon the district and as such that it is your view that an environmental assessment will be required in accordance the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004. Having considered the criteria set out in Schedule 1 of the Regulations and the information contained with Appendix 1 of your scoping report, we find no reason to disagree with your conclusion that an Environment Assessment is required.
English Heritage	No specific comments on the requirement for SEA but note that the Scoping Report is considered to set out the basis of an appropriate framework against which to assess the likely impact of the Policies and proposals of this DPD upon the historic environment
Natural England	No specific comments on the requirement for SEA but do make helpful comments on various aspects of the Scoping Report.

## APPENDIX 2

<b>Sustainability Objectives and Assessment Rationale (relevant to allocations of land for housing and employment)</b>		
<b>SA Objective</b>	<b>Perfor- mance</b>	<b>Commentary</b>
<b>1. Quality housing available to everyone</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Will it make housing available to people in need?</i></li> </ul>	✓	Site size would allow the council to negotiate an element of affordable housing under current policy
	✓✓	Site size will be capable of delivering a significant amount of affordable housing (30+)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Will it improve energy efficiency in housing?</i></li> <li>• <i>Will it increase the use of sustainable building practices?</i></li> </ul>	✓	Core Strategy Policy EQ1: Reducing Risks to the Environment addresses energy efficiency and sustainable design and construction
<b>2. Conditions and services to engender good health</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Will it promote positive health and prevent ill health?</i></li> <li>• <i>Will it encourage healthy lifestyles?</i></li> <li>• <i>Will it address health inequalities</i></li> </ul>	✓	Site is within 1km of a play area or amenity open space and/or 3km of an outdoor sport facility
	✓✓	Site is within 1km of a play area or amenity open space and/or 3km of an outdoor sport facility and is large enough to accommodate new amenity open space/play area
	x	Development would effect existing or proposed sporting or recreational facility (including allotments)
	xx	Development would effect existing or proposed sporting or recreational facility (including allotments) in those wards rated as amongst the most deprived or second most deprived 25% of England's population in terms of health inequality.
<b>3. Safety and security for people and property</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Will it reduce crime and disorder through design measures?</i></li> <li>• <i>Will it reduce fear of crime?</i></li> </ul>	✓	Core Strategy Policy C1: Inclusive Communities recognises the importance of design to reduce the fear of crime and incidence of anti social behaviour
<b>4. Vibrant communities which participate in decision making</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Will it reduce the potential for social isolation with particular regard to disadvantaged groups?</i></li> </ul>	✓	Provision of affordable housing will contribute to creating mixed, well balanced communities helping to reduce social isolation
	✓✓	Provision of a significant amount of affordable housing will contribute to creating mixed, well balanced communities helping to reduce social isolation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Will it improve and increase community facilities?</i></li> </ul>	(✓)	(For sites 1ha+) Large site with potential for mixed uses, incorporating community facility(ies). (Urban areas only)
	x	Loss of a community facility
	x	Adverse impact on local schools
<b>5. Culture, leisure and recreation activities available to all</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Will it increase availability and accessibility of culture/leisure/recreation activities/venues?</i></li> </ul>	✓	Opportunity for site to meet the recreational needs of the area, in addition to its own open space requirements.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Will it preserve, promote and enhance culture in the District?</i></li> </ul>	x	Development will result in loss of all/part of any of the following: park or garden, outdoor sports facility, amenity open space , play area for children/teenagers, an allotment, a village hall or any other building/area of cultural, recreational or amenity value to local people
<b>6. Local needs met locally</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Will it ensure that everyone has access to essential services &amp; resources within reasonable non car based travelling distance?</i></li> </ul>	✓✓	The site schedule indicates a positive score for accessibility to jobs, shops and services and therefore residents are considered to be able to access services and commute to work by non-car modes of transport.
	x	The site schedule indicates a negative score for accessibility to jobs, shops and services and therefore residents are considered to be unable to access jobs, shops and services and commute to work by non car modes. It does, however lie within the development limit of the main urban centre.

	(x)	The site schedule indicates a negative score for accessibility to jobs, shops and services and therefore residents are considered to be unable to access jobs, shops and services and commute to work by non car modes. However, it is within 400m of a bus stop on the key bus network.
	xx	The site schedule indicates a negative score for accessibility to jobs, shops and services and therefore residents are considered to be unable to access jobs, shops and services and commute to work by non car modes.
	(v)	The site lies within a Group B/Group C village. The definition of the village is based upon its accessibility to jobs, shops and services as set out in the Core Strategy.
	x	The site lies within a Group C village. The definition of the village is based upon its accessibility to jobs, shops and services as set out in the Core Strategy. This village does not have a key bus service.
	<b>For Employment Sites</b>	
	✓✓	Employment site accessible by public transport
	x	Employment site not accessible by public transport
• Will it provide appropriate housing for local needs?	<b>Score as 1</b>	See comments made under objective 1
• Will it support the vibrancy of town and village centres?	✓	Development of the site will enhance the vibrancy of the town/village centre
<b>7. Education and training opportunities which build on the skills and capacity of the population</b>		
• Will it promote lifelong learning and widening participation in lifelong learning activities? • Will it improve levels of basic skills • Will it provide opportunities for training and apprenticeships	(v)	Employment is proposed as part of the allocation and this may bring opportunities for apprenticeships and training
<b>8. Bio-diverse and attractive natural environment</b>		
• Will it protect and enhance existing priority habitats and species and provide for long term management of wildlife habitats?	✓	Neutral or slight effects on designated sites (SINC, SSSI, LNR) and/or priority habitats and species
	x	Some adverse effects on designated sites (SINC, SSSI, LNR) and/or priority habitats and species but appropriate siting/scale or mitigation should enable development
	xx	Very adverse effects on designated sites (SINC, SSSI, LNR) and/or priority habitats and species
• Will it increase the quality and quantity of woodland cover?	x	Development would adversely affect a significant area of woodland cover
• Will it make use of opportunities wherever possible to enhance the environment as part of other initiatives	?	The site is large enough to incorporate an area of natural/semi natural greenspace (including woodland) which will increase wildlife interest, biodiversity and woodland cover. On-site provision is only required in certain circumstances
• Will it promote and raise awareness of the enjoyment/benefits of the natural environment/biodiversity and promote access to wildlife on appropriate sites?	✓	There is a public right of way close to the site
	✓	The natural interest of, and access to, nearby sites of natural interest will be promoted through this site's development
• Will it protect and enhance the region's rivers, estuary and coastal waters to achieve good ecological status?	x	Adverse impact
• Will it contribute to local distinctiveness and countryside character?	✓	Slight adverse effect – relatively few landscape constraints
	x	Moderate adverse – Some adverse effects but could be mitigated
	xx	High adverse effect – Only appropriate if other factors are strongly in favour
	✓	Minor or no conflict with the purposes of Green Wedge designation
	x	Significant conflict with the purposes of Green Wedge designation
	xx	Major conflict with the purposes of Green Wedge designation
<b>9. Minimal pollution levels</b>		
• Will it clean up contaminated land?	✓	Development will result in the clean up of contaminated land
• Will it maintain and where possible improve air quality?	✓	No impact on objective values stated in the 2007 Air Quality Strategy
	x	Adverse effect on objective values stated in the 2007 Air Quality Strategy
	xx	Significant adverse effect on objective values stated in the 2007 Air Quality Strategy
• Will it maintain and where possible improve surface water and groundwater quality?	?	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it maintain and where possible improve soil quality and minimise the loss of soils to development</li> </ul>	✓	Brownfield land – limited loss of soils
	x	Greenfield land – loss of soils
	xx	Loss of Best and Good Agricultural Land (Grade2/3)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it prevent unacceptable levels of noise and light pollution?</li> </ul>	x	A major road/railway line/industry lies close to the site
<b>10. A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impacts</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it increase access to key resources and services by means other than the car</li> </ul>	<b>Score as 6</b>	See comments under objective 6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it ease congestion on the road/rail network?</li> </ul>	(x)	Although residents of this Group B/C settlement/village would be able to access jobs, shops and services by using non car modes of transport, there may be increase travel demand to higher order centres.
	x	This Group C village is not served by a bus on the key bus network
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it increase provision of public transport where needed?</li> </ul>	O	This Group B/C settlement/Village is on the key bus network
	x	This Group C village is not served by a bus on the key bus network and the scale of development proposed will not directly secure improvements to provision
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it improve existing provision of cycleways and footpaths?</li> </ul>	x	Existing footpaths and verges are remote and represent an unpleasant walking environment
	✓	There is already good existing footpath provision to serve this site
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it make the environment for non car travel more attractive?</li> </ul>	?	Planning obligations for improved facilities for non car modes of transport should be investigated
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it improve rail services and facilities?</li> </ul>	✓	The site offers the opportunity to enhance existing rail facilities (eg through improvements to pedestrian access/parking or park and ride)
	✓✓	The location offers the opportunity to provide a new rail halt
<b>11. Minimise greenhouse gas emissions and a managed response to climate change</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it reduce greenhouse gas emissions?</li> </ul>	✓	Site lies within 400m of a bus stop on the key bus network.
	x	The site is not within 400m of a bus stop on the key bus network
	xx	The site is not within 400m of a bus stop on the key bus network (50+ dwellings)
	(x)	The site lies within a Group B village deemed to provide good access to jobs and services. However there may be increase travel demand to higher order settlements
	x	The site lies within a Group C village deemed to provide good access to jobs and services. However there may be increase travel demand to higher order settlements. This particular settlement is not on a key bus/rail route
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it increase the amount of energy from renewable sources that is generated and consumed?</li> </ul>	✓	RSS Policy ENV5 requires new developments of more than 10 dwellings or 1000m <sup>2</sup> of non-residential floorspace should secure at least 10% of their energy from decentralised and renewable or low carbon sources
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it reduce the risk of flooding?</li> </ul>	✓✓	Not in an area at risk from flooding (all within Flood Zone 1)
	✓	Development boundary can be amended to remove risk of flooding
	x	In an area at risk from flooding (Flood Zones 2 and 3a) Affects only a small area of the option
	xx	Most of the site is in an area at risk from flooding (Flood Zones 2 and 3a)
<b>12. Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resource with minimal production of waste</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it increase efficiency in water, energy and raw material use?</li> </ul>	x	New development will increase the use of primary resources, with new households resulting in an increase in energy and water consumption.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it make efficient use of land (appropriate density, brownfield in preference to Greenfield, protect good agricultural land?)</li> </ul>	✓	Would utilise brownfield land as part of the development
	x	Greenfield land but not Best and Good Agricultural Land
	xx	Loss of Best and Good Agricultural Land
	✓	The site can accommodate at least 30 dwellings/hectare
	x	Constraints mean that the site can not accommodate 30 dwellings/hectare
	✓✓	The site can accommodate more than 35 dwellings per hectare
	✓	The site can accommodate 35 dwellings/hectare
	x	Constraints mean that the site can not accommodate 35 dwellings/hectare
✓✓	The site can accommodate more than 40 dwellings per hectare	

	✓	The site can accommodate 40 dwellings/hectare
	x	Constraints mean that the site can not accommodate 40 dwellings/hectare
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it increase prevention, re-use, recovery and recycling of waste</li> </ul>	x	New development will result in an increase in waste during the construction phase with new households increasing the amount of waste produced.
<b>13. Protect and enhance the historic environment</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it enhance features and areas of historical/cultural value?</li> <li>Will it promote sensitive re-use of historic/culturally important buildings where appropriate?</li> <li>Will it conserve the character of historic settlements and conservation areas?</li> <li>Will it preserve and where appropriate enhance features of archaeological importance?</li> </ul>	✓	Development is unlikely to have a detrimental impact on the historic environment
	x	Development will impact on the historic environment, but appropriate mitigation measures should enable some development to be acceptable
	xx	Development of this site would adversely impact on the historic environment
<b>14. A quality built environment and efficient land use patterns, that make good use of derelict sites, minimise travel and promote balanced development</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it promote the development of communities with accessible services, employment, shops and leisure facilities?</li> </ul>	N/A	Accessibility has already been addressed under objectives 6 and 10. Scoring here would result in double counting
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it prevent inappropriate development in flood plains?</li> </ul>	N/A	Flood risk has already been assessed under objective 11 (see above). Scoring here would result in double counting
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it ensure new developments provide essential services accessible without use of a car and are accessible by public transport?</li> </ul>	N/A	Accessible services have already been addressed under objectives 6 and 11. Scoring here would result in double counting.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it result in the regeneration of derelict or visually unattractive land?</li> </ul>	✓	Provides for the regeneration of derelict or visually unattractive area
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it encourage the re-use of existing buildings?</li> </ul>	✓	The buildings on site are capable of re-use/conversion
	x	Demolition of buildings/structures would be required
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it ensure high design quality which supports local distinctiveness?</li> </ul>	✓	Site re-development provides an opportunity for high quality design
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it promote mixed use development?</li> </ul>	✓	Mixed use scheme proposed.
<b>15. Good quality employment opportunities available to all</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it provide employment opportunities for local people?</li> <li>Will it contribute to improving diversity of employment opportunities?</li> </ul>	✓✓	Site for employment
	✓	Development will provide employment opportunities as part of a mixed use scheme.
	xx	Loss of employment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it ensure employment opportunities are accessible by public transport?</li> </ul>	✓✓	Employment site accessible by public transport
	x	Employment site not accessible by public transport
	xx	Loss of employment site accessible by public transport
<b>16. Conditions for business success, economic growth and investment</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it support existing businesses?</li> <li>Will it maximise local skills?</li> <li>Will it encourage investment (including inward investment)?</li> <li>Will it provide for the needs of business (such as a range of premises, land and infrastructure)?</li> </ul>	✓	Provision of affordable housing will help support existing businesses with the recruitment and retention of staff
	xx	Existing businesses on site will be displaced
	xx	Site provides a useful supply of low grade employment land
	✓✓	Provision of employment land will encourage investment and support local business expansion
	✓	Provision of employment land as part of a mixed use scheme will encourage investment and support local business expansion